REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 23, 2003, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-51 are pending in this Application.

In the Specification, the noted paragraphs have been amended to correct minor editorial problems. No new matter has been added.

In the Claims, Claim 46 has been amended solely to correct a minor editorial problem. This amendment is not made to distinguish any prior art, nor to limit its scope in any fashion, nor for reasons of patentability as contemplated in *Festo* and its progeny.

Claims 1-9, 11-20, and 22-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,574,630 (Augustine, et al.). Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention and assert that the present claimed invention is not anticipated by any teaching in the Augustine reference.

Independent claims 1, 12, 23, 25, 27, 33, 39, 41, 43, 46, and 49 all recite receiving (or generating) an "event notification string... and identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event information." (Emphasis added). The independent claims thus require both the event notification string and additional information that identifies the resource that is to process the event information.

Augustine, et al. fails to teach or imply the presence of any such additional "identification information" within the event notification that "identifies" any "executable resource" within events manager 101 that is to process the event notification. Instead, Augustine teaches that all processing operations occur within events manager 101 solely under the events manager's control and without any direction or identification by the source of the event notification string of what resource is to do the processing. See, e.g., column 8, lines 32-39: "Events manager 101 reviews the message text... [and if it] detects an identifier

symbol... then events manager 101 converts the contents of that information release 180..." See also column 8, lines 40-46: "Events manager 101 then causes an information notification message 190 to be transmitted via electronic mail message." And, as noted in Fig. 16 and column 9, line 35 through column 10, line 34, events manager 101 performs all of the processing steps 520 through 545 without any direction or identification "of an executable resource" being conveyed to events manager 101.

In summary, there is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in the Augustine reference that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that Augustine's "event notifications" indicate how or by what resource the event notification information is to be processed. Accordingly, for failing to teach all of the elements of each independent Claim, the Augustine reference cannot anticipate the independent Claims. Furthermore, as each dependent Claim depends from an unanticipated base Claim, each dependent Claim is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as its respective base Claim.

Claims 10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Augustine in view of Nelson, U.S. Patent No. 6,496,568 (hereinafter Nelson). While Nelson generally teaches an event notification system, it neither teaches nor implies a system wherein the event notification itself contains "identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event information," as recited in each independent Claim. See, e.g., column 5, lines 37-42 of Nelson: "This notification message represents some event identified within the airline system possibly requiring notification to the customer. If it is an event requiring notification as determined in step 310, CMM 105 determines the set of customer devices to which notification is required in step 315."

Accordingly, Nelson (either considered alone or in combination with Augustine) cannot form a basis for an obviousness rejection: Nelson fails to

teach all elements of each independent Claim. As all independent claims are thus distinguished over Nelson, as well as Nelson in combination with Augustine, the present obviousness rejection of dependent claims 10 and 21 is therefore moot.

Applicants believe that the Claims as amended are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested. Furthermore, Applicants believe there is no fee required for this amendment. If the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deems a fee necessary, this fee may be charged to the account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul E. Lewkowicz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 44,870
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-2414

Dated: March 10, 2004